



**Angelo State University**  
**Operating Policy and Procedure**

**OP 06.28 Annual Performance Evaluation for Tenured and Tenure Eligible Faculty**

**DATE:** August 1, 2017 *{Effective fall 2017}*

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this Operating Policy/Procedure (OP) is to establish guidelines and procedures for annual performance evaluation of tenured and tenure-track faculty.

**REVIEW:** This OP will be reviewed on the same schedule as OP 06.23 by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs in cooperation with Faculty Senate. This policy may be amended only by action of the Board of Regents of the Texas Tech University System.

**POLICY/PROCEDURE**

**1. Description and Purpose**

An annual evaluation is required by the University for all tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Annual evaluations of faculty performance provide timely feedback on faculty performance in all areas of job performance as well as tracking progress toward tenure eligibility. Annual evaluations of faculty performance are also critical data used for decisions regarding continuance of employment for tenure-track faculty members.

This policy does not address University and accreditation requirements for post-tenure review (see OP 06.19, Regulations for Performance Evaluation of Tenured Faculty). It also does not address the evaluation and promotion processes for faculty not eligible for tenure.

**2. Department-Level Performance Criteria**

Faculty members shall be evaluated annually for progress toward tenure and promotion criteria as established by each academic department/program. The process by which these criteria are established is located in OP 06.23 (Tenure and Promotion Standards and Procedures), Section 3.

**3. Procedures for Evaluation**

Because the annual performance evaluation is an integral part of the tenure and promotion process described in OP 06.23, the following timelines shall be observed.

- a. Each faculty member shall prepare the following materials for submission to the Department Chair according to the timelines listed in Section 5. All documentation may be submitted on paper or in digital form, but the faculty member may not mix formats.

- (1) A synopsis of relevant activities pursuant to the department performance criteria, organized according to the three general areas of job performance (teaching, scholarly activity, and professional service) and concluding with a set of specific personal goals for the next academic year. The synopsis shall not exceed (3) double-spaced pages in length, and a current curriculum vitae (CV) should accompany the summary. *It is the responsibility of the faculty member to clearly describe all activities, goals and measures to facilitate review.*
- b. Tenured faculty in the department shall be responsible for participating in the review of evaluation materials. The number of evaluators shall be no less than three (3). The Department Chair may not serve as an evaluator.
  - (1) If a department has fewer than three (3) tenured faculty members in a given year (excluding the Department Chair), the Department Chair shall invite tenured faculty members from other departments within the College to reach the minimum number in Section 3.b. above.
  - (2) If a department has more than seven (7) tenured faculty members (excluding the Department Chair), the Department Chair has the option to conduct an election to allow the tenured faculty members to select a seven (7) person committee. It is not permissible to appoint tenured faculty members to serve as peer evaluators.
- c. The Department Chair shall conduct an election to identify one (1) tenured faculty member to act as an *ad hoc* Chairperson for the current year only in order to administer this review process. This person shall ensure that all faculty members have access to necessary information (i.e., current performance criteria, employee materials, etc.) and adequate time to complete reviews. The Chairperson may also request additional information from faculty members to support and provide clarification about the activities listed in their summaries and/or CVs.
- d. Each faculty member shall be rated by each peer evaluator according to the following rubric:
  - “On track to surpass target criteria”
  - “On track to meet target criteria”
  - “Improvement needed to meet target criteria”
  - “Unsatisfactory progress toward meeting target criteria”
- e. Faculty member(s) shall be evaluated by comparing the work reported in the submitted documentation against the Department-level criteria currently in force. One rating shall be assigned for each criteria domain only. If a rating of “*Improvement needed to meet target criteria*” or “*Unsatisfactory progress toward meeting target criteria*” is assigned by an individual reviewer, that person must submit a written justification for that rating. In all other cases, raters are encouraged (but not required) to include feedback to colleagues whenever possible to facilitate the Department Chair’s role in the evaluation process. Also, evidence of mitigating circumstances that contributed to the lower rating may be considered, but ratings shall not be artificially elevated to account for those circumstances.
  - (1) *EXAMPLE: Scholarly activities may not meet target expectations in a given year if a faculty member is asked to assume an unusual teaching load in the wake of*

*unexpected faculty departures. These factors can be considered by the peer evaluators. In this case, the rating for the “scholarly activity” domain for that year might be “improvement needed to meet target criteria” but with a footnote describing the unusual circumstances.*

- f. The *ad hoc* Chairperson is responsible for collecting, de-identifying, and documenting these justifications, as well as finalizing ratings. The final domain ratings for each faculty member shall be the median rating. If the median rating falls between domains, the higher rating shall be assigned.
- g. The individual and median domain ratings, feedback, and justifications shall be submitted by the *ad hoc* faculty chairperson to the Department Chair.
- h. The Department Chair shall conduct individual meetings with tenure-track faculty members to discuss ratings and future goals. The purpose of these meetings is to provide an annual opportunity for tenure-track faculty members to work with Department Chairs on matters of Department support, resource availability, and other issues that could facilitate the faculty member’s pursuit of tenure or promotion.
  - (1) All tenure-track faculty members shall participate in a meeting with the Department Chair, regardless of assigned ratings.
  - (2) All tenured faculty members shall be exempt from this step of the process unless the Department Chair requests a meeting.
- i. Following these meetings, the Department Chair shall write a brief statement regarding each faculty member’s progress toward tenure and/or promotion and include that statement on the evaluation form. All documentation for each faculty member (peer review ratings/comments, Chair statement, faculty summaries and CVs) shall then be forwarded to the College Dean. The Department Chair may not unilaterally alter or change ratings received from the department faculty.
- j. The College Dean shall review the materials submitted for each faculty member and may consult with the Department Chair on those materials to clarify points of confusion, ambiguities in ratings, or other concerns. The College Dean may not unilaterally alter or change ratings or Department Chair recommendations.
- k. The College Dean shall write a brief independent statement regarding each faculty member’s materials, include it with the other documentation, and then submit all documents to the office of the PVPAA. The College Dean shall also provide a recommendation for reappointment.
- l. The PVPAA shall review the materials provided for each faculty member and provide a recommendation to the President for final approval.

#### **4. Expected Minimum Ratings for Criteria Domains**

- a. Assistant-rank and Associate-rank faculty members shall be generally expected to receive ratings of “*on track to meet target criteria*” (or better) in all three performance domains.
- b. Professor-rank faculty members shall be generally expected to receive a rating of “*on*

- track to meet target criteria*” (or better) in two (2) of the three job performance domains, one of which must be teaching effectiveness.
- c. If received ratings are lower than these expectations in a given year for tenure-track faculty members, developmental planning may occur for that faculty member upon the mutual agreement of the Department Chair and the College Dean. This mechanism is not intended to be a formal disciplinary action, but to assist the faculty member in the achievement of personal and organizational goals for the next academic year.
  - d. Demonstrated inability or unwillingness to adhere to department expectations and/or developmental plans may lead to an adverse employment decision for tenure-track faculty members.

## **5. Timelines for Evaluations**

- a. A Year One evaluation, defined as the first full year of service to ASU in residence, shall be initiated no later than the first Friday of the Spring semester of the first year of service. It shall be completed in its entirety no later than the sixth Friday of the Spring semester of the first year of service.
- b. All other annual evaluations, including Year Two and Third-Year evaluations but excluding the year in which the faculty member is being evaluated for tenure/promotion, shall follow the same timeline below:
  - (1) Faculty members shall submit materials to the ad hoc faculty chairperson by the third Friday of the Fall semester.
  - (2) The faculty chairperson shall submit ratings and materials to the Department Chair by the sixth Friday of the Fall semester.
  - (3) Department Chairs shall submit materials and personal recommendations to the College Dean by the ninth Friday of the Fall semester.
  - (4) College Deans shall submit all materials along with their independent recommendations for reappointment by the eleventh Friday of the Fall semester.

Attachment A: [\*Faculty Evaluation Form\*](#) (*Tenured and Tenured Track*)

Attachment B: [\*Department Peer Evaluation\*](#) (*Tenured and Tenured Track*)